

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed November 15, 2005.

The claims have all been replaced, achieving as one objective the elimination of the term “partitioning,” which although described in the specification and believed to be clear in context, appears to have been a source of unnecessary and unresolvable confusion.

The Amendment also attempts to respond to another possible source of confusion, regarding the term “appointment.” The claims recite “[a] method for scheduling an appointment,” implying that an appointment for purposes of the claims is a mere potentiality until it is scheduled (and becomes therefore a scheduled appointment). To make this explicit, the term “potential” has been added to modify the term “appointment” where that term is used prior to scheduling. It should also be understood that an appointment need not be a meeting with particular person and may correspond more generally to a function, such as “Birthday” as noted in Figure 16A of Rasansky, U.S. Patent No. 5,960,406 (“Rasansky”), for Friday, December 12, 1997.

Applicant therefore agrees with the Examiner that Rasansky shows time-slots and appointments on the displays in Figures 16A and 17A. However, Rasansky did not anticipate the claims as previously presented, and does not anticipate the new claims, at least for the following reason.

The Examiner refers to Col. 17, lines 50 - 56, reciting “check boxes” which, allegedly, are clickable spaces from which a user can select a combination of time-slot and appointment as claimed. These “check boxes” are discussed in connection with Figure 17C and referenced as “1625,” but Applicant cannot find the reference designator “1625” in Figure 17C or in any other Figure of Rasansky. So it is not clear what the check boxes are or do, but it is clear from Figures

17A - 17C that many steps, and many clickable spaces, are required for specifying a particular combination of time-slot and appointment, which is contrary to the claims. The claims have always been clear that clicking in a single clickable space is enough to schedule an appointment, i.e., enough to select both (a) a time-slot, and (b) an appointment.

New claim 43 adds a further distinction over Rasansky, i.e., displaying a plurality of choices for the potential appointments corresponding to a single time-slot. With this feature, clicking on the selected clickable space not only selects a particular combination of time-slot and appointment, but also selects a particular appointment from among at least one displayed alternative that corresponds to the same time-slot. Rasansky proposes nothing that even comes close to providing this functionality.

Since all of the rejections are based on the fundamental allegation that Rasansky anticipates the broadest claims, it is respectfully requested that all the rejections be reconsidered in light of the foregoing comments.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Garth Janke', is written over the printed name.

Garth Janke
Reg. No. 40,662
(503) 228-1841